

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERGE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| | | | | | | | ٠ |
|--------------------|--|------|------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|
| | APPLICATION NO. | FILI | NG DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | ٦ |
| | 09/609,598 | 06/ | /29/2000 | Jay S. Walker | 00-023 | 1725 | - |
| | 22927 | 7590 | 11/16/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| | WALKER DIGITAL FIVE HIGH RIDGE PARK | | | | THEIN, MARIA TERESA T | | |
| STAMFORD, CT 06905 | | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | _ |
| | • | | | | 3627 | | |

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Interview Summary | 09/609,598 | WALKER ET AL. | | | |
| interview Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Marissa Thein | 3627 | | | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO | personnel): | | | | |
| (1) Marissa Thein. | (3) Mr. Jason Skinner. | | | | |
| (2) Mr. Michael Cuff. | (4) <u>Ms. Magdalena Fincaem</u> . | | | | |
| Date of Interview: <u>04 November 2004</u> . | | | | | |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2 | 2) <mark> applicant's representative</mark> | e) | | | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: | e)□ No. | | | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> . | | | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: <u>U.S. Patent No 6,285,986 Andrews et al.</u> . | | | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g | g)□ was not reached. h)⊠ N | I/A. | | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants explained how their invention differs from the Andrews reference, specifically, claim 1. Examiners explained their interpretation of claim 1 and how it is obvious over the Andrews reference. Examiners recommended to amend the claim so as to overcome the Andrews reference. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | | | | | |
| | | ICHAEL CUFF MARY INER | | | |
| Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action | YManua S | ature if required | | | |